

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of January 4, 2004 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 25, and 26 and cancels claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21-24, 27, and 28. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, and 26 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification regarding providing proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12-16, 19, 20 and 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,116); and rejected claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohta as applied to claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12-16, and 19 in view of Kang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,464,669).

The examiner objected to the specification as not disclosing the recited limitation: “wherein x value of white light out of the liquid crystal display device is in the range of 0.29 – 0.33 and y value is in the range of 0.30 – 0.34”. This objection is now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1, 12, 23 and 24.

The rejection of Claims 1, 12, 23, and 24 is now moot as those claims are now canceled. Claims 5 and 16 have been amended to be in independent form and to incorporate most of the limitations of claims 1 and 3 and 12 and 14 respectively. Claims 5 and 16 were rejected as being obvious over Ohta. But, claims 5 and 16 are allowable over Ohta in that claims 5 and 16 recite a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein the first alignment layer comprises one of polyimide, SiO₂, polyvinylalcohol and polyamic acid.” Ohta does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 16 and claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 15, 19, 20, 25, and 26, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Washington, D.C. telephone number 202-496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: June 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant